

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
6 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
7 AT SEATTLE

8 WAYNE PERRYMAN, *et al.*,

9 Plaintiffs,

10 v.

11 CITY OF SEATTLE POLICE, *et al.*,

12 Defendants.  
13


No. C17-0274RSL

ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFFS'  
MOTION TO AMEND COMPLAINT

14 This matter comes before the Court on “Plaintiff’s [sic] Amended January 2017  
15 Complaint,” which the Court treated as a motion to amend. Dkt. # 46. The motion is unopposed,  
16 and courts “should freely give leave [to amend] when justice so requires.” Fed. R. Civ. P.  
17 15(a)(2). In light of the “strong policy in favor of allowing amendment” (Kaplan v. Rose, 49  
18 F.3d 1363, 1370 (9th Cir. 1994)) and the lack of any evidence of “undue delay, bad faith or  
19 dilatory motive on the part of the movant, repeated failure to cure deficiencies by amendments  
20 previously allowed, undue prejudice to the opposing party by virtue of allowance of the  
21 amendment, or futility of amendment, etc.” (Sonoma County Ass’n of Retired Employees v.  
22 Sonoma County, 708 F.3d 1109, 1117 (9th Cir. 2013) (internal quotation marks and alterations  
23 omitted)), the Court accepts the amended complaint filed on May 31, 2017 as the operative  
24 pleading in this matter. Prior versions of the complaint are superceded.  
25  
26

ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFFS'  
MOTION TO AMEND COMPLAINT

1 Dated this 27th day of June, 2017.

2   
3 Robert S. Lasnik  
4 United States District Judge  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26